

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: see form PCT/ISA/220		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/220 (page 2)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/052027	International filing date (day/month/year) 9/3/2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 10/2/2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G08G1/04		
Applicant Robert Bosch GMBH		

<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the opinion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application </div>	
<p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>	
<p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>	

Name and mailing address of the ISA/	Authorized officer Coda, R
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/052027

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Not Applicable

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/052027

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

2004/052027

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/052027

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

see supplementary page

WRITTEN REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY

(ADDENDUM)

International Application No.

PCT/DE2004/052027

Item V

1. The present Report refers to the following documents:

D1: DE 42 37 721 A (ATLAS ELEKTRONIK GMBH) May 11, 1994
D2: DE 195 42 871 C (STN ATLAS ELEKTRONIK GMBH) November
28, 1996
D3: EP 0 940 792 A (STN ATLAS ELEKTRONIK GMBH) September
8, 1999
D4: US 4 604 738 A (AGGARWAL RAJ ET AL) August 5, 1986

2. Document D1 is regarded as the closest prior art. It
discloses:

A method for classification, as defined by the preamble
of Claim 1.

It also describes an increase in the value of the
confidence parameter, by the fact that firstly a pre-
recognition of the object to be classified is performed,
which pre-recognition must be confirmed by a specific
test criterion.

This can occur within a predefined time window.

The certainty, i.e. the confidence parameter, is thus
raised, and the false alarm rate is lowered.

The Examiner is therefore of the opinion that the Claim
is not at present correctly distinguished over the prior
art in the two-part form, and recommends a rephrasing.

E1322952284

3. At least document D1 should be incorporated into the Description. The relevant prior art described therein should be clearly defined.

It should also be possible to deduce clearly, from the Description, which features of independent Claim 1 are not disclosed in D1. The object that is to be achieved in inventive fashion by way of these additional features should furthermore be deducible.